



Canadian Social Science
Vol. 12, No. 11, 2016, pp. 33-41
DOI:10.3968/8896

ISSN 1712-8056[Print]
ISSN 1923-6697[Online]
www.cscanada.net
www.cscanada.org

Millennium Development Goals: An Appraisal of Poverty Eradication in Nigeria 2000-2015

Stanley C. Igwe^{[a],[b], *}

^[a]Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Nigeria Police Academy, Kano, Nigeria.

^[b]Ph.D., Candidate, College of Law, Government, and International Studies, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia.

*Corresponding author.

Received 9 August 2016; accepted 14 October 2016

Published online 26 November 2016

Abstract

Nigeria in the year 2000 in line with the United Nations Millennium Declaration subscribed to among other Millennium Development Goals to eradicate poverty by at most the year 2015. The study assessed if this goal has been met via corroborated document review of extant data while drawing upon statistical statements on the continued incidence of poverty within the country amidst impressive economic growth records during the period under review. The study found that poverty alleviation measures had no significance on the target population due from the nature of their design and short term duration; while income disparity remained highly diverged. The persistent high poverty level in the country was traced to Marxist structural theories of poverty in which the redistribution of wealth in society endures more within classes than between classes. The study thus, recommends that funds committed to palliative poverty alleviation programmes should be diverted to the provision of enduring basic amenities like uninterrupted power supply and good roads that would impact on the lives of the generality of the people; while funds raised from privatisation should be reinvested in the evolution of new industries to enhance economic activities and enable more employment opportunities.

Key words: Nigeria; Human development; Millennium development goals; Poverty; Income Disparity; Pro-rural development

Igwe, S. C. (2016). Millennium Development Goals: An Appraisal of Poverty Eradication in Nigeria 2000-2015. *Canadian Social Science*, 12(11), 33-41. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/8896>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/8896>

INTRODUCTION

On September 8, 2000, representatives of 189 countries including 147 heads of state converged at the United Nations (UN) headquarters in New York, not only to commemorate the dawn of a new millennium but also to reaffirm their faith in the UN and its charter as indispensable foundations for a more peaceful, prosperous and just world.

Member-states further adopted for themselves the UN Millennium Declaration which outlined within a single framework the key challenges facing humanity at the threshold of the new millennium, while also outlining a response to these challenges upon which a set of objectives was drawn (Prammer & Martinuzzi, 2013).

In recognition of the need to translate this commitment into action, a broad inter-agency consultation arrived at what became known as the “millennium development goals” (MDGs), comprising of eight key goals supported by 18 specific targets and about 48 indicators for monitoring progress all to be attained on or before the year 2015 (Prammer & Martinuzzi, 2013; Hulme, 2009).

Easterly (2009) assessed that MDGs comprised the following:

- a) To reduce the poverty rate by half by 2015 compared to its level in 1990;
- b) To attain universal primary enrollment by 2015;
- c) To promote gender equality and empower women;
- d) To reduce child mortality rates by two-thirds;
- e) To eradicate maternal mortality;
- f) To combat HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria;

- g) To reduce the population without clean water by half;
- h) Ensure environmental sustainability and develop a global partnership for development.

The foremost goal of the Millennium Declaration—"to eradicate extreme hunger and poverty" has been chosen for assessment in lieu of continued mass poverty in Nigeria.

With a current population of about 173 million people, Nigeria is the most populous country in Africa and accounts for 47% of West Africa's population. It is also the biggest oil exporter in Africa, with the largest natural gas reserves in the continent (World Bank, 2015).

Be that as it may, Nigeria has remained one of the worst places in the world to live in due from prevalent high level of poverty as the country ranks among the least 28 poverty ridden countries of the world (UNDP 2001; Ogujiuba, 2014; Ofoegbu, 2013; Adeleke, 2012; Edet, 2015).

This became even more glaring with the release of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) human development report for the year 2015 where the country clinched an abysmal 153rd position out of 188 countries recorded in the entry (UNDP, 2015).

At the global level, the 2015 UN Report on the MDGs acclaims that the 15-year effort at attaining the MDGs produced the most successful anti-poverty movement in history as it generated new and innovative partnerships around the world while lifting over a billion people out of extreme poverty among other gains (UN, 2015, p.3; Joulaei, Maharlouei, Tabrizi, & Lankarani, 2016; Kumar, Kumar, & Vivekadhish, 2016).

Paradoxically, Nigeria's level of revenue and endowment are diametrically opposed to the poverty level evident in the country. While the revenue profile of the country rose from N4 billion in 1975 to N26 billion in 1980, the percentage of the poor grew from 15% in 1960 to about its present 70% (UNDP, 2001).

UNDP (2001) further reports that while the highest income bracket constituting only 10% of the population shares 32% of total national income, the poorest 10% has only 1.5%. Nearly 50% of total national income are owned by 18% of the highest income group. In contrast, the poorest 20% of the population own only 4 percent of total national income; and that though Nigeria ranks 6th and 7th in petroleum export and petroleum production respectively; yet, the country is classified as the 25th poorest nation in the world. All indicating that impressive economic growth occasioned rapid rise in poverty for majority of the populace contrary to rational expectations.

The National Bureau of Statistics (2010) cited in Adeleke (2012), corroborates that "112.519 million Nigerians live in relative poverty conditions" and that the incidence of poverty in Nigeria worsened between 2004 and 2010 as the number of unemployed members

of the labour force rose from 12.3% in 2006 to 23.9% in 2011. However, during the same period, the Nigerian economy grew significantly at an average annual growth rate in excess of 6.6%, making the country the 5th fastest growing economy in the World in 2010 at 7.87% real growth rate (Ofoegbu, 2013).

To this end, the aim of this mini review paper is to appraise poverty reduction efforts in Nigeria along the lines of the MDGs to which the country is a signatory while unveiling challenges observable in the implementation of poverty alleviation programmes with a view to proffering recommendations that would serve the needs of the government and society at large in that direction.

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Mass poverty has led the Nigerian state to be reckoned as one of the most highly retrogressively developing country of the world in social, economic and technological terms. All evident in mass graduate unemployment and widespread anti-social activities like, internet scam, cultism, drug trafficking, ritual killings, political vandalism and assassinations among others of their kind.

From yet another perspective, the period under review witnessed perhaps more industrial turmoil than any other epoch in Nigeria's history.

This situation has been especially orchestrated by incessant hikes in the prices of basic goods and accentuated by widespread retrenchments following from the implementation of the second phase of privatisation and the 2004/2005 bank re-capitalisation exercise which saw the laying off of thousands of workers (Okonkwo, 2014).

The sorry situation is further exacerbated by excessive income disparity which polarises the country into a few overly rich persons and a countless massively poor people who further suffer from lack of basic infrastructure like absence of regular power supply and environmental pollution from so many rickety vehicles besides absence of affordable accommodation, among other deprivations.

Government effort at alleviating poverty within the period under review witnessed the launching of a consortium of poverty alleviation schemes; notable among them the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in 2000; National Economic Empowerment Development Strategy (NEEDS), launched in 2004 and the Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme (SURE-P) launched in 2012, (Ogujiuba, 2014; Okonkwo, 2014; Obadan, 2001).

These however failed chiefly due from poor strategic planning and the one-cap-fits-all type of poverty alleviation schemes that rarely took cognisance of the varying heterogeneities in the abilities and preferences of the individuals among other associated problems.

Perhaps Nigeria is the only country that plots poverty alleviation programmes on the premise that distributing motorbikes and sewing machines will lead to poverty alleviation; while the major funds allocated for the programmes are hijacked by political party loyalists and their acolytes.

Worse still, the country has no data base of new entrants into the job market or plans for them to be hired yet within the period under review found it difficult to retain the comparatively very few that were already employed.

2. METHODOLOGY

The study adopts an interpretive approach within which the document review holds preeminence.

For Loftus (2006) the interpretive paradigm is defined within the premise that “meaning” is a human creation which varies according to peoples’ world-view and perceptions.

In other words “meaning” is not simply discovered but socially constructed (Crotty, 1998).

The term “document,” broadly describes printed and other materials relevant to a study, including public records, personal documents and physical artifacts (Merriam, 1998, p.70).

Like facts deriving from observations, “documents” are ready-made or discreet sources of data that enrich the context of a given study as they enhance the discovery of issues deep-seated within the topic under review while also framing the context within which interpretations can be readily made.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Poverty in Nigeria was first measured in 1980 by the Federal Office of Statistics (FOS), when 27.2% of the population, or 18 million of the population were classified as poor. By 1985, the FOS estimated that about 46% of Nigerians live below the poverty level but it dropped to 43% by 1992. This rate surged to 66% (67 million people) from a 1996 survey from where it rose to 70% or 90 million people by 2012 (Khalid, 2012).

Nigeria has adopted various policy strategies in the past decade to stimulate economic growth. While these efforts have yielded measurable results in economic growth, much of development challenges in the country, particularly, unemployment and poverty have persisted. (Agu & Evoh, 2011; Okonkwo, 2014; Orji, 2005; Tersoo, 2013; Ofoegbu, 2013).

There is not as yet a general consensus on the definition of the term “poverty” given that the phenomenon impacts on numerous aspects of human condition such as the physical, moral and psychological, hence, a concise and acceptable definition of poverty

is elusive as it cannot be captured only by income and consumption based measures (Anyanwu, 1997; Nweze & Ojowu, 2002).

Nweze and Ojowu (2002), however, categorised poverty into three fragments according to their level of intensity, comprising; absolute poverty, relative poverty and subjective poverty.

Eneh, (2011) on his part describes poverty as the condition of not having the means to afford basic human needs such as clean water, nutritive food, health care, education, clothing and shelter. It may also include lack of access to opportunities such as education and employment which aids the escape from poverty and allows one to enjoy the respect of fellow citizens.

For Olayemi cited in Asamu and Adedoyin, (2014) the poor are those who lack a stable income, have little property and cannot maintain a healthy living. They also lack an adequate level of education; they have no access to basic necessities of life; they are unable to meet social and economic needs and obligations; lack skills and gainful employment; have little or no physical assets and sometimes lack self esteem.

3.1 Nigeria’s Human Development Ratings

The human development approach for measuring poverty was developed by Pakistani economist Mahbub ul Haq in 1990 and is officially used by the UNDP for measuring human development index (Sen, 2000).

Haq’s aim was “to shift the focus of development economics from national income accounting to people centered policies” and away from neoliberal assessment of economic growth by per capita income (Haq, 1995).

The human development approach is anchored on the evaluative framework of the “capabilities approach” (CA) which counteracts existing models of assessing development like the commodity, utilitarian and libertarian approaches (Kronlid, 2009).

The traditional welfare theories for Sen (1999) inadequately express and evaluate well-being and quality of life since well-being is rarely found in the assets that a person possesses but in what a person can be or do, using those assets. Thus, the CA views development as the enlargement of human capabilities such as knowledge, physical well-being and social freedom, in contrast to the enlargement of utility or financial income since money is means to an end rather than an end in itself (Sen, 1999, p.75).

At its core, CA is about providing individuals with the opportunities to live the lives that they have reason to value.

Thus, this approach is especially meritorious because of its “considerable reach and depth” (Alkire, 2005, p.123) towering above earlier standards of measurement scales. It is especially reflective of “life expectancy, literacy levels, and command over the resources necessary to enjoy a decent standard of living” (UNDP, 1990).

Nigeria's most recent human development index, (HDI) value was cited in the introductory part of this paper. The years preceding 2015 expressed no much difference from the present.

As observable from table 1 below, a rise in purchasing power parity from 3,606 dollars in 2005 to 5,341 dollars in 2014, expresses significant positive change yet HDI value rose from 0.467 to 0.514 showing a significant widening of the income gap:

Table 1
Nigeria's Human Development Index (HDI) for Some Selected Years of the Period Under Review

Year	Life expectancy at birth	Expected years of schooling	Mean years of schooling	GNI per capita (2011 PPP\$)	HDI value
2005	48.7	9	5.2	3,606	0.467
2010	51.3	9	5.2	4,825	0.493
2011	51.7	9	5.5	4,926	0.499
2012	51.7	9	5.7	5,018	0.505
2013	52.1	9	5.9	5,166	0.51
2014	52.8	9	5.9	5,341	0.514

Source: Evolved from UNDP, Human Development Report (2015).

3.2 Nigeria's Poverty Rating Within the Period

From a 2012 cross country analysis of some selected countries, Table 2 below shows Nigeria ranking No.6 with 70% of her population living below the poverty line in close parity with disaster and war torn countries like Liberia, Haiti and Chad whereas there has neither been war nor natural disaster in Nigeria.

Table 2
Country Comparison Analysis of Population Below Poverty Line From Six Countries

Rank	Country	(%) population below poverty line
1	Chad	80
2	Haiti	80
3	Liberia	80
4	D.R Congo	71
5	Sierra Leone	70.2
6	Nigeria	70

Source: Compiled from CIA (n.d.).

The situation is even more politically embarrassing when the country is compared with countries as Malaysia, South Korea and Indonesia that are not as highly endowed in natural resources and yet shared similar poverty levels with Nigeria in the 1960s. These countries have experienced marked industrialisation, steady power supply and improved quality of life for the vast majority of their population since the '90s while Nigeria cannot confidently say it is on the path to industrial growth (Aiyede, 2010, cited in Ojo, 2012).

3.3 Overview of Government Effort at Eradicating Poverty Within the Period Under Review

One of the earliest poverty alleviation schemes in Nigeria was designed to improve on agriculture which was notably the mainstay of the Nigerian economy prior to the commercialisation of oil production. This measure gave rise to what became known as Agricultural Development Projects (ADPs) with branches in all the states of the federation and featured especially in distributing high yield breeds of both crops and livestock.

For the period under review poverty alleviation featured especially the re-entry of former President Olusegun Obasanjo who led Nigeria into the new millennium and subsequently introduced a number of and neoliberal policies and programmes aimed at poverty alleviation.

The Obasanjo administration (1999-2007) initiated the Poverty Alleviation Programme, (PAP), in 2000 as a palliative interim policy to immediately curb the high rise of unemployment widespread all over the country. This was closely followed by the launching of the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) which was designed to replace PAP with a view to checkmating absolute poverty (Obadan, 2001).

NAPEP was variously assessed as an improvement over the previous poverty-reduction programmes having trained as many as 130,000 youths and engaged 216,000 people, but as Wohlmuth et al. (2009) lamented most of the beneficiaries were rarely the targeted very poor people of the populace.

Following closely behind NAPEP the National Economic Empowerment Development strategy (NEEDS) was launched by the government in March 2004 not just as a measure for poverty alleviation but for privatising hitherto unviable state enterprises and by so doing obtain lasting macroeconomic stability. Pride of place was also given to production, infrastructure, human resource development and strengthening of the private sector (Ogujiuba, 2014).

NEEDS was thus saddled with a four pronged objective viz: employment generation, poverty reduction, wealth creation and value reorientation all to be attained within a four year medium term plan from 2003 to 2007 (IMF, 2005).

3.3.1 Vision 20:2020

The vision 20:2020 policy was articulated during the Obasanjo administration and was contrived as a ten year plan for stimulating Nigeria's economic growth to make it one of the twenty largest economies in the world by the year 2020 (Igbuzor, 2009).

On assumption of office in May, 2007, the Yar'Adua administration set up the National Council on Vision 2020 in collaboration with the National Planning Commission to develop a blueprint for the actualisation of the vision 20:2020.

3.3.2 The Seven-Point Agenda

The Seven-Point Agenda (2007-2010) articulated the policy priorities that would strengthen existing reforms and rebuild the economy. The Agenda aimed to achieve double digit growth rates and make Nigeria one of the 20 largest economies in the world by the year 2020 through focusing on the following seven priorities: i. Power and Energy; ii. Reforms; iii. Food Security; iv. Transportation; v. Land Reforms; vi. Security and vii. Education.

Yar'Adua's administration was however cut short by ill-health on 5 May 2010, leading to the ascendancy of his vice Goodluck Jonathan (Al Jazeera, 2010).

3.3.3 Transformation Agenda

The Transformation Agenda of the Jonathan administration (2011-2015) drew its inspiration from the seven-point agenda and was targeted at the following:

- a) Job Creation,
- b) Public Expenditure Management,
- c) Foreign Policy and Economic Diplomacy,
- d) Human Capital Development Policies, Programmes and Projects,
- e) Infrastructure Policies, Programmes and Projects,
- f) Enablers for Sustainable Growth and Development (Ogujiuba, 2014).

3.3.4 Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme (SURE-P)

The Jonathan administration's Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme (SURE-P) were a subset of the Transformation Agenda and like NEEDS was designed as a 3 to 4 year programme (Ogujiuba, 2014).

Essentially, SURE-P was introduced in 2012 following the uproar that trailed the upward review of the pump price of petrol from N65 to N97 in January 2012. The ultimate goal was to reduce unemployment among graduates and stimulate economic growth, as part of prior transformation agenda of the current administration, while also enhancing opportunities towards the attainment of Vision 2020 (Information Nigeria, 2012; Omafume, 2014).

SURE-P was abruptly scrapped in February 2016 by the incumbent Buhari administration.

3.4 Appraisal of the Poverty Alleviation Programmes

Virtually all the poverty alleviation programmes failed because they were of short term duration and were not designed to embrace the mass of acutely poor population of the country rather they involved the sharing of sewing machines and motorcycles and their like to some select few.

For Ikeabenyi (2009) NEEDS made substantial progress in the implementation of structural reforms, including liberalisation of Nigeria's import tariffs regime transactions, introduction of a Wholesale Dutch Auction

System (WDAS) for foreign exchange, and restructuring and privatising state-owned enterprises.

To this end, Ikeanyibe (2009) and Bambale (2011) among several contributors to the literature affirmed that the banking sector reforms of the NEEDS era made Nigerian banks more viable to support industrial growth and reduce the rate of bank failures.

The entire exercise however progressed significantly with respect to economic growth during the period as the Central Bank of Nigeria, (CBN) (2006) cited in Olokoyo (2012), submitted that the amount of foreign direct investment (FDI) inflow into Nigeria stretched to US\$2.3 billion in 2003 and rose to US\$5.31 billion in 2004 (138% increase) this figure rose again to US\$9.92 billion (87% increase) in 2005.

The economy further grew by 134% to N1.123 trillion (US\$9.6 billion) in 2007 of which out of a total US\$36 billion of FDI that went into Africa in 2007, Nigeria received 26.66% of the inflow. But very unfortunately the significant rise in economic growth all through the years of Needs coexisted alongside morbid poverty (Olokoyo, 2012).

Ikeanyibe, (2009), however narrates that the entire scheme resonated with the neoliberal agenda of foreign creditors noting that the Central Bank of Nigeria alone terminated the employment of some 804 employees through mandatory retirement in 2005 due from the recapitalisation exercise that saw to the convergence of 89 existing banks to 25.

The exercise further witnessed the throwing into the unemployment market of thousands of retrenched bank workers while pushing several existing community banks out of existence thereby worsening the unemployment situation (Ikeanyibe, 2009).

In his assessment of the administration central to the period under review Okonkwo (2014) explains that poverty alleviation under the Obasanjo administration was not a success story because it did not make an appreciable impact on the standard of living of the majority of the people and moreso because of the unending labour strikes that characterised the tenure of the administration.

Okonkwo further clarifies that the Obasanjo administration's policies were anti-labour and pro-poverty in their inclination all at variance with the Chapter II section 16 (1) b and (2) c of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria which enjoined the State to:

control the national economy in such a manner as to secure the maximum welfare, freedom and happiness of every citizen on the basis of social justice, and equality of status and opportunity....(and to ensure) that the economic system is not operated in such a manner as to permit the concentration of wealth or the means of production and exchange in the hands of few individuals or of a group. (1999 Constitution, cited in Okonkwo, 2014)

IMF (2005) on its part assumes that the \$4.5 billion to which NEEDS was billed for was an amount too exorbitant for a medium term project of just four years.

From another dimension, Orji (2005) identified that for the poverty alleviation programmes frequent policy changes and inconsistent implementation prevented continuous progress creating a climate of uncertainty, resulting in most operators having very short – run perspective of the objectives of the programme.

Orji (2005) further identified that most of the programmes were developed on the rather erroneous assumption that the poor generally constitute a homogenous group and therefore relatively uniform prescription could be applied across board.

On his part Tersoo (2013) examined the strategies adopted by NAPEP and the impact it had on the beneficiaries of Benue State and found that just a paltry 6.7% of his respondents actually benefitted from the micro-credit scheme of the capacity acquisition programme (CAP) of which the original aim was to train beneficiaries in the various skills and trade after which they will be assisted with start-up capital in form of loans to start their own micro-businesses.

Ofoegbu (2013), carried out a study on the role of micro-financing on rural poverty and found that the credit obtained from corporative societies was more significant in the alleviation of poverty than those gotten from government microfinance banks.

From yet another perspective, continued disappearance of wage-employment opportunities during the period under review was rife. This fact was corroborated by the Nigeria National Association of Chambers of Commerce, Industry, Mines and Agriculture, (NACCIMA), report that some 800 companies in Nigeria closed down between 2009 and 2011 due to harsh business operating environment. This situation, according to Nkwocha, (2012) resulted from the Nigerian state trailing Western style trade liberalisation and global competitiveness without home-grown policies for protecting local infant industries.

4. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Perhaps, Nigeria's paradox of poverty amidst plenty may best be identified within the structural theories of poverty in a country where a small segment of society through their control of state power simply expropriate to themselves and their acolytes the major part of the nation's wealth; yet rarely reinvests looted resources within the economy while the majority poor are consigned to a circle of poverty (Kwanashie, 1998, p.316).

Essentially, poverty within the structural school of thought advances that structural factors inherent in either the economy and/or to several interrelated institutional environments serve to favour certain groups over others,

usually based on gender, class, or race according to Jordan (2004).

To this end, Marxist proponents of the structuralist school of thought advance that capitalism creates conditions that promote poverty as the capitalists control the distribution of reward system and so appropriate the rewards stemming from the accumulated surplus of the workers' production for themselves (Calhoun et al., 2002).

This implies that poverty is a class rather than an individual or group affair and the redistribution of resources ends up within classes other than between classes. As such, it is the macro-structure of a capitalist society that produces inequality and consequently poverty (Domhoff, 2005).

Within this ambit, Beeghley (2000) using the nature of poverty in the United States as case study explains that the impact of such an economic structure undermines individual effort at economic progress irrespective of hard work or skill while ensuring that millions of people remain poor.

As such Sanchez and Davis (2014) advance that for Marxian economists, economic growth (as has been the case of Nigeria within the period under review) alone is insufficient to lift poor people out of (relative) poverty, because those who belong to certain classes reap the benefits of the overall income resulting from economic growth of the country. Hence, Marxists view the role of class and group discrimination, which are largely political issues, as central to poverty.

Glaringly, the dilemma of the majority poor in Nigeria typifies the structuralists' position given that whenever economic growth occurs, it is never redistributed by all sectors making it a highly dysfunctional society for which Joseph (1978) tagged Nigeria a "prebendal state" by which he describes the character of "patron-clientilism" or "neo-patrimonialism" in Nigeria where elected officials, government workers, and members of their ethnic and religious groups assume they possess a natural right to government revenue.

Little wonder, the UNDP in its 2008-2009 report on Nigeria made clear that Nigeria harbours a systemic structure of inequity; within which just 20% of the population own 65% of national assets while as much as 70% of the entire population are peasant rural workers and artisans. This veritably means that following from inequalities, opportunities for upward mobility are very limited which altogether consummates in few decent jobs; poor income and low purchasing power of the employed. It also means poor infrastructure and institutional failure in key sectors including education, health and transportation (UNDP, 2009).

To this end and incontrovertibly, it is not entirely surprising that a country which produces crude oil for exports expended a loathsome 20.2 trillion naira on

the importation of petrol, diesel and kerosene between January 2010 and September 2015. (National Bureau of Statistics, (NBS) cited in Adebayo, 2016).

5. FINDINGS

The sad truth about Nigeria, according to NBS (2010) cited in Chukwuebuka and Chidubem (2011) is that “well over half of the entire populace of Nigeria do nothing for a living.”

Poverty remains widespread in Nigeria given the continued dominance of poor human development indication occasioned by widespread income disparity irrespective of significant economic growth within the review period.

Poverty alleviation programmes during the period under review failed to meet the needs of the target population due from poor design and their short term duration.

The situation was worsened by their outright abrogation by successive administrations. The nature of income disparity and poverty in Nigeria requires long term programmes which must come under close assessment as they progress.

On yet another note, it would be irrational to assume a given programme would succeed if a preceding one failed especially where the new does nothing to improve on the preceding in terms of design and outreach. Yet, the period under review witnessed frequent change of poverty alleviation programmes but no change in design or outreach.

In sum, virtually all the poverty alleviation programmes lacked the focus to turn around the poor lives of the majority of the people. NEEDS for instance was more a neoliberal agenda to privatise state owed companies other than a poverty alleviation programme and ended only to increase the misery of more people than it met as widespread retrenchment of workers dominated the scene.

CONCLUSION

The provision of basic amenities like uninterrupted power and good roads ought to precede poverty alleviation programmes as a greater mass of the people stand to benefit more from the provision of basic infrastructure than poverty alleviation programmes that impact on the lives of a select few.

Poverty alleviation programmes to be sustainable must be drawn to withstand regime change and cannot be actualized on short term basis.

Funds raised from privatisation should be reinvested in the evolution of more industries in the petroleum sector where crude is exported only for refined petroleum products of the same crude oil imported back to the

country. This would assuage capital flight and also create employment.

Nigeria could borrow from Indonesia by promoting the establishment of agro-based industries in the rural areas to stem rural-urban migration.

REFERENCES

- Adebayo, O. (2016, February). *Nigeria imported N20.2trn fuel in five years—NBS*. Today.ng February 1, 2016. Retrieved from <http://www.today.ng/business/73850/nigeria-imported-n20-2trn-fuel-in-five-years-nbs>
- Adeleke, A. (2012). Improving poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria through small and medium scale agricultural development projects. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4, 11.
- Agu, U., & Evoh, C. J. (2011). *Macroeconomic policy for full and productive and decent employment for all: The case of Nigeria* (No.467212). International Labour Organisation. Employment Sector Employment Working Paper No.107. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_policy/documents/publication/wcms_169560.pdf
- Alkire, S. (2005). Why the capability approach? *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 6(1), 115-135.
- Al Jazeera. (2010, May). *Nigeria's president Yar'Adua dies*. Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/africa/2010/05/20105523627997165.html>
- Anyanwu, J. C. (1997). Poverty in Nigeria; concepts and measurement and Determinants. In NES (comp.), *Poverty alleviation in Nigeria*. Ibadan: N.E.S. Secretariat.
- Asamu, F., F., & Adedoyin, T. H. (2014). Challenges and prospects of poverty alleviation strategies in Nigeria. *African Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 25-38.
- Bambale, A. J. (2011). National economic empowerment development strategy and poverty reduction in Nigeria: A critique. *Journal of Economic and Financial Review*, 1(1), 15-24.
- Beeghley, L. (2000). *The structure of social stratification in the United States*. New York, NY: Pearson.
- Calhoun, C., Gerteis, J., Moody, J., Pfaff, S., Schmidt, K., & Virk, I. (2002). *Contemporary sociological theory*. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishing.
- Chukwuebuka, E. C., & Chidubem, I. V. (2011). The political economy of public service accountability in Nigeria. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 1(4), 8-18.
- CIA. (n.d). *World factbook*. Retrieved from <http://www.indexmundi.com/g/r.aspx?v=69>
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundation of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Domhoff, G. W. (2005). *Wealth, income, and power*. Retrieved from <http://sociology.ucsc.edu/whorulesamerica/power/wealth.html>

- Easterly, W. (2009). How the millennium development goals are unfair to Africa. *World development*, 37(1), 26-35.
- Edet, L. I. (2015). The paradox of economic growth without development in Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 20(5), 64-77.
- Eneh, O. C. (2011). Nigeria's Vision 20:2020-issues, challenges and implications for development management. *Asian Journal of Rural Development*, 1(1), 21-40.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (FGN). (2010). *Millennium development goals report 2010*. Retrieved from [http://nigeria.unfpa.org/files/2010%20MDG%20Report%20\(Nigeria\).pdf](http://nigeria.unfpa.org/files/2010%20MDG%20Report%20(Nigeria).pdf)
- Haq, M. (1995). *Reflections on human development*. New York: Oxford University.
- Hulme, D. (2009, September 30). *The millennium development goals (MDGs): A short history of the world's biggest promise*. BWPI Working Paper No.100. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1544271>
- Igbuzor, O. (2009). *Challenges of development in Nigeria*. Lagos: Robitos Alliance Publishers.
- Information Nigeria. (2012, August). *FG Subsidy Re-investment and Empowerment Programme (SURE-P) graduate internship scheme 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www.informationng.com/2012/08/fg-subsidy-re-investment-and-empowerment-programme-sure-p-graduate-internship-scheme-2012.html>
- International Monetary Fund. (2005). *Nigeria: Poverty reduction strategy paper—national economic empowerment and development strategy*. IMF Country Report No. 05/433.
- Ikeanyibe, O. M. (2009). Development planning in Nigeria: Reflections on the national economic empowerment and development strategy (NEEDS) 2003-2007. *Journal of Social Science*, 20(3), 197-210.
- Joseph, R. (1978). Affluence and underdevelopment: the Nigerian experience. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 16(2), 221-239.
- Jordan, G. (2004). The causes of poverty: Cultural vs. structural: Can there be a synthesis? *Perspectives in Public Affairs* 18(24), 18-34.
- Joulaei, H., Maharlouei, N., Tabrizi, R., & Lankarani, K. B. (2016). The millennium development goals: A global assignment. *Shiraz E-Medical Journal*, 17(1).
- Khalid, S. (2012). *The politics of poverty eradication in Nigeria*. Retrieved from <http://www.gamji.com/article6000/NEWS6036.htm>
- Kronlid, D. O. (2009). Sigtuna think piece 2 climate capabilities and climate change education research. *Southern African Journal of Environmental Education*, 26(1), 27-37.
- Kumar, S., Kumar, N., & Vivekadish, S. (2016). Millennium development goals (MDGS) to sustainable development goals (SDGS): Addressing unfinished agenda and strengthening sustainable development and partnership. *Indian journal of Community Medicine: Official Publication of Indian Association of Preventive and Social Medicine*, 41(1), 1.
- Kwanashie, M. (1998). Impact of poverty on sustainable growth and development. In CBN (comp.), *Proceedings of the seventh annual conference of the zonal research unit* (pp.310-323). Abuja: CBN Research Department.
- Loftus, S. F. (2006). *Language in clinical reasoning: Using and learning the language of collective decision makin* (Doctoral thesis). The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2123/1165>
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Nkwocha, J. (2012) *Nigeria and Indonesia: A socio-economic analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2012/09/nigeria-and-indonesia-a-socio-economic-analysis/>
- Obadan, M. I. (2001). Poverty reduction in Nigeria: The way forward. *CBN Economic and Financial Review*, 39(4).
- Ofoegbu, D. I. (2013). Rural poverty in Nigeria: The role of micro-financing. *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 3(3).
- Ogujiuba, K. (2014). Poverty incidence and reduction strategies in Nigeria: Challenges of meeting 2015 MDG targets. *Journal of Economics*, 5(2), 201-217.
- Okonkwo, C. E. (2014). National economic empowerment development strategies (Needs) and labour in Nigeria, 2003-2007. *Journal of Good Governance and Sustainable Development in Africa*, 2(2).
- Ojo, E. O. (2012). Constraints on budgeting and development plan implementation in Nigeria: An overview. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 1(3), 445-456.
- Olokoyo F. O. (2012). Foreign direct investment and economic growth: A case of Nigeria. *BVIMSR'S Journal of Management Research*, 4(1).
- Omafume, G. E. (2014). *Evaluating SURE-P three years on*. Vanguard News. Retrieved from <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/12/evaluating-sure-p-three-years/>
- Orji, J. A. (2005). An assessment of impacts of poverty reduction programmes in Nigeria as a development strategy, 1970-2005. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation from Department of Management and Policy*, St. Clement's University, Turks and Caicos Island.
- Prammer, E., & Martinuzzi, A. (2013). The millennium development goals (MDGs) and the Post-2015 Debate. *European Sustainable Development Network, (ESDN Case Study No.13)*. Retrieved from http://www.sd-network.eu/pdf/case%20studies/ESDN%20Case%20Study_No%2013_MDGs%20and%20post-2015%20debate_FINAL.pdf
- Sanchez, M. M., & Davis, P. (2014). A review of the economic theories of poverty. *National Institute of Economic and Social Research NIESR Discussion Papers 4*, 35. Retrieved from http://www.niesr.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publications/dp435_0.pdf
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Sen, A. (2000). A decade of human development. *Journal of Human Development*, 1(1).
- Tersoo, K. S. (2013). An assessment of national poverty eradication programme on wealth creation in Benue State. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(19).
- This Day. (2016, February). *SURE-P scrapped*. Retrieved from <http://www.thisdaylive.com/articles/sure-p-scrapped/224646/>
- United Nations. (2015). *Millennium development goals report*. New York, USA: United Nations. Retrieved from [http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20\(July%201\).pdf](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%201).pdf)
- United Nations Development Programme. (2001). *Human development report*. Nigeria 2000/2001 Millennium Edition. Lagos: UNDP.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (1990). Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/219/hdr_1990_en_complete_nostats.pdf
- United Nations Development Programme. (2009). *Human development report Nigeria 2008-2009 achieving growth equity*. UN house, Abuja: UNDP.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2015). *Human development report: Nigeria*. Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/NGA.pdf
- Wohlmuth, K., Alabi, R. A., Burger, P., Gutowski, A., Jerome, A., Knedlik, T.,...Urban, T. (2009). *New growth and poverty alleviation strategies for Africa-Institutional and local perspectives*. Berlin: LIT Verlag Münster.
- World Bank, (2015). *Nigeria overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria/overview>